



81256

52

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION VII  
726 MINNESOTA AVENUE  
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101

JUN 29 1989

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Cherokee County GW/SW Pilot Test, June 19, 1989  
Conference Call With PRPs and CH2M Hill

FROM: Glenn Curtis  
SPFD/REMD *Glenn*

TO: File

On the subject date, a conference call was held with Ken Paulsen, AMAX; Mark Logsdon, Adrian Brown Consultants; Neil Geitner, Bill Bluke, Dick Glanzman and Dave Nicholson of CH2M Hill; and Glenn Curtis, EPA. This call pursued the continuing conversation on the details of operating the subject pilot test. Issues of concern relate to the duration of the project, receipt of analytical results and future schedule.

Continuing the June 18 discussions with the subject participants, the direction of the pilot test was discussed. The idea of the rainwater test was discussed with all parties. Mark Logsdon provided his interpretation of how the test was currently being run. Mark had directed his field personnel, subsequent to the delays introduced by the Sunday and early Monday morning work stoppages, to mix one-half pore volume of artificial rainwater with one-half pore volume of pond water in the head tank above the flow-through test. Subsequent to this pore volume introduction, nine pore volumes of pond water would be run through the tanks. At that time, (20 pore volumes through the tanks) an additional 10 pore volumes of pond water would be introduced into the flow-through tank. The approximate 30 volume test would conclude mid-day on Thursday. To extend the duration of the project beyond this point would most likely require an additional budget expenditure on the part of the PRPs, beyond that currently authorized in Mark's budget. Mark and Ken expressed concern about extending the project without conversations with the other PRPs and clear direction from EPA on the goals and reasoning for continuing the pilot test.



S00082188  
SUPERFUND RECORDS



CH2M Hill expressed concern at concluding the pilot test and dismantling and removing the test equipment prior to the receipt of any laboratory data on total metals. What appeared confusing to Hill was that their contract with the same Joplin Lab called for a one-day turnaround in laboratory analysis. The PRPs have a contract for a five-day turnaround. Subsequently, analytical data for the first 10 pore volumes (first cycle) will not be received until Friday (June 23, 1989) with the rest of the data received in approximately one week. Hill suggested leaving the tanks in place in a condition (full of water) agreeable to the PRPs. These tanks would remain onsite until the laboratory data could be reviewed and a determination made whether complete and appropriate results had been obtained. Specifically, CH2M Hill is concerned that an equilibrium point be reached prior to concluding the flow-through test.

Questions remain to be answered. A delay in the schedule and completion of the PRP pilot test report appears imminent regardless. Should EPA advise the PRP group that without laboratory justification, EPA cannot guarantee acceptance of the pilot test results. What would the water quality goals be for calling the test complete?

cc: Jane Kloeckner, CNSL

—

—